RENAISSANCE DRAMATIC TEXTS

An Exhibition
held at the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library

October - November 1975

On the occasion of
the Eleventh Annual Conference on Editorial Problems
October 31st - November 1975

Italian Renaissance Drama

Cases 1 and 2

The European Renaissance that began in fourteenth century Italy and spread northward, had diverse effects on each country it visited, but a common factor everywhere was the revival of interest in the classics. For the playwright in Renaissance Italy, this meant imitating the classical models and observing their strict rules: unity of time and place, decorous characters and the use of a chorus to narrate events that could not take place on the stage. While not all of us would agree with Fletcher's statement

> "Cramped by the so-called Aristotelian unities and gagged by Horatian decorum, Italian plays of the sixteenth century had small chance of life, and few indeed have lived; few did live even for their contemporaries" (1)

it is true that early Renaissance drama was constrained. But Italian drama did live and still lives both in the original forms and in the plays it inspired in every country in Europe and in every century.

Italian drama was not limited to the two or three "regular" kinds; tragedy, comedy and pastoral; but went on to develop new genres: tragi-comedies, pescatori, maritimmi, satiri, and perhaps the most famous of all, the commedia dell'arte all'immproviso. As the name implies, the actors and actresses improvised the dialogue as they went along, and imbued the stock characters with local traits and dialects. While these latter plays themselves did not last, the characters did: Harlequin and Pulcinella being the most durable. These improvisations were but a small part of the whole, and this exhibition is an attempt to show some of the highlights of Italian Renaissance drama. With the exception of the music score of L'Euridice, all items are from the collections of the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library.

TASSO, TORQUATO, 1544-1595

The bucolic poetry of the ancients was revived during the Renaissance as pastoral drama, and Italian pastoral drama reached its apogee in Tasso's Aminta, which was written when the author was at the court of Ferrara and first performed in the summer of 1573 by the Gelosi under Tasso's direction.

Shown here is the special large-paper Bodoni edition, one of the rarest volumes of the Bodoni Press. This Aminta was published in an edition of only 15 copies on paper, and 1 on vellum. The editor of the text was Pierantonio Serassi; in a long preface, Serassi gives the literary and bibliographical history of the work, saying that he prepared the text from the original manuscript by Tasso, in his possession. Gamba, however, disputed this claim.

(1) J.B. Fletcher, Literature of the Italian Renaissance (New York: Macmillan Co., 1934), p. 276.

DOLCE, LODOVICO, 1508-1568

Marianne, based on Josephus' History of the Jews, has been called Dolce's masterpiece; it is certainly among the best tragedies of the sixteenth century. Hampered and restrained by the Neoclassic rules of poetics, and by his own lack of poetic ability, Dolce still managed to create impressive characters, whose speeches are well within the bounds of reality.

This elegant first edition was printed in Venice by Giolito de' Ferrari in 1565.

BONARELLI DELLA ROVERE, GUIDUBALDO, CONTE, 1563-1608

Bonarelli's fame rests mainly on his very popular pastoral play, Filli di Sciro, described as being the best after L'Aminta and Il Pastor fido. It continued to be the standard model for its class well into the nineteenth century. It was reprinted three times within the first year and later reissued all over Europe. Our first edition features the fine engraved plates of Francesco Valesio, showing a variety of pastoral stage costumes.

ACCADEMIA DEGL'INTRONATI, SIENA

The Accademia degl'Intronati of Siena was the first regular academy in Italy, with laws, symbolic name and emblematic device (which appears in the border at the head of the title page). It began in 1525, during the youth of Enea Silvio Piccolomini, later Pope Pius II. and lasted for two hundred and twenty-six years. Although devoted principally to poetry, it began very early to produce comedies, many of which were written by its members. The first of these was Gli Inganni in 1531. The authorship of this play has been attributed to Lodovico Castelvetro, but more likely it was a collaboration of the members of the Academy.

FILIPPO, PUBLIO

Adapted from the Asinus aureus of Apuleius, Filippo's Formicone was a mixture of what he considered the best points of Roman drama. Without the elaborate intrigues typical of sixteenth Italian comedies, it had a simple plot, and maintained the unity of time, so beloved of the Neoclassicists, while the characters were changed to make them more realistic. Filippo also retained one feature common to both Roman and Renaissance dramas; he kept women off his stage. Hence the young mistress, an important character in the plot, is never seen in this early version. Later this was modified to allow her to appear, but this aspect of Italian drama is an interesting feature in its history.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/renaissancedrama00unse

ARIOSTO, LODOVICO, 1474-1533

In the prologue to the 1508 edition of La Cassaria, Ariosto broke with tradition. Instead of using the prologue to give the argument and background of the play, he had it announce the originality of his new work, thus heading off any criticism that might arise from his writing in the vernacular. Adapted from classical Roman models, but not dependent on any of them, La Cassaria was a comedy of deception and tricks, still maintaining the important unity of time and place, even to the extent of having one of the characters, a servant, refuse to go into the house of his master, therefore making his master come into the street to carry on a conversation.

Not rated as the best of Ariosto's works, it is more important for the prologue than for its language, plot or characters.

ANDREINI, ISABELLA, 1562-1604

Mirtilla, a pastoral play was the first work by Isabella Andreini, the most famous actress of her time and a gifted poetess, who numbered Tasso among her admirers. She was the leading comedienne of the theatrical company of the Gelosi, and was as well known in France as in Italy.

The edition shown is a variant of the first (Verona, Dalle Donne e C. Franceschini, 1588) and seems to be unrecorded except by the bibliographer of the Prince of Liechtenstein's library.

PERI, JACOPO, 1561-1633

Shown are two examples of the earliest operas, La Dafne and L'Euridice, both first printed in 1600. As some others shown here, they were first performed for a select company, the latter as part of the wedding festivities held at Florence in honour of Henry IV, King of France and Maria de' Medici. L'Euridice is the first opera for which the music by Peri is extant. The origins of La Dafne are still clouded; we know the text was written by Rinuccini, but as the music has been lost, the honour of being the composer is still divided between Peri and Caccini, with more weight being thrown to Peri. Earlier fragments of music written by Jacopo Corsi for La Dafne have recently been found, only to cloud the issue and the date of first performance still further. Sonneck argues in favour of 1597 and, since his essay, no new evidence has been found to upset this theory.

CECCHI, GIOVANNI MARIA, 1518-1587

By regarding himself as an emancipated modern, and disregarding all the rules of poetics, Cecchi became one of the most popular playwrights of his day. He wrote in prose and verse, tragedies and comedies, farces and religious dramas, adaptations of Roman epics and original works. He

had a good ear for the Tuscan dialect and an eye for the style of life in sixteenth century Florence. His plays are valuable to the student of Renaissance life as well as of Renaissance language, reflecting as they do the realities and absurdities of the life of their time.

This rare first edition of one of his sacred dramas L'Esaltazione della croce, is especially interesting for the section describing the scenery and action of the play, and was printed in Florence in 1592.

DOVIZI, BERNARDO, DA BIBBIENA, CARDINAL, 1470-1520

La Calandria, written by Dovizi, later to become Cardinal Bibbiena, was first performed at the spring carnival in Urbino in 1513, but did not appear in print until 1521. According to Herrick, it was one of the most important and most influential of all the "commedie erudite". Adapted from Plautus' Menaechmi, the addition of new characters and new complications to a classical plot shows the further development of Italian Renaissance comedy. It has become a standard learned comedy, providing generations of playrights with a model plot and characters.

Our edition features manuscript notes regarding the first performance of this play.

BRUNI, LEONARDO ARETINO, 1369-1444

The authorship of this early play is debatable, but generally attributed to Leonardo Bruni. A transitional comedy based on antique models, Poliscene comes between the "rappresentazioni sacre" and the "commedie erudite". It is classical in form and in some of its characters, but there is a complete disregard for the classical rule of unity of time; the action taking place over six days. Its modernity may be seen in the characters' attitude to life. In one speech, Poliscena deplores the fact that unmarried girls are forbidden by social conventions to enjoy sexual pleasures until their marriage! This is a complete reversal from Roman comedies where the playwright was not free to criticize family and mores.

This comedy, while not enjoying general popularity in fifteenth century Italy, was widely reprinted and discussed in Northern Europe during the sixteenth. Our edition was printed in Leipzig in 1503 by Melchior Lotter.

TRISSINO, GIOVANNI GIORGIO, 1478-1550

Trissino's Sophonisba is acknowledged as the first modern tragedy and is based on classical models. It is also the first vernacular tragedy in blank verse.

Trissino wrote in Italian, as he wished to reach those people who had no other language beyond their mother tongue and therefore could not delight in the "manners, sentiment and discourses" of his work. Although popular

(it was reprinted at least 10 times between 1524 and 1620), it was not produced on the stage until twelve years after the author's death, and then it failed to delight the very people he had wanted to reach.

This second edition was the first to show the author's efforts to reform Italian spelling, by using the Greek ω. It was printed in Vicenza by Tolomeo Janicolo in 1529 and reproduces the first edition's cursive type.

CARRETTO, GALEOTTO DAL, MARCHESE, 1495-1531

An earlier version of La Sophonisba was written by Carretto in 1502, but not produced until 1546. Carretto's version is still medieval in form and is comparable to the style of the "rappresentazioni sacre"; a series of twenty-seven episodes separated by the chorus which give us Sophonisba's complete history. There is, however, no unity of time and place; the action ranges from Africa to Spain to Sicily over a period of years. In making his play purely tragic, Carretto was moving away from the "rappresentazioni sacre" which combined joy and sorrow, and trying to follow the earlier classical traditions.

We have no real evidence that Trissino ever saw or was in any way influenced by Carretto's earlier version. The earliest edition in our collections is that printed at Venice in 1546 by Giolito de' Ferrari.

BECCARI, AGOSTINO, ca. 1510-1590

Beccari announces, in one of the two prologues to La Sacrifizio, that it is the first pastoral drama. However debatable the point, Beccari fixed for many years the love triangles so much a part of pastorals; A loves B loves C loves D loves E, etc., and all must be untangled and brought to a satisfactory, if not happy, ending.

The book shown is part of volume 17 of Rubbi's Parnaso italiano (Venezia, 1785).

PARABOSCO, GIROLAMO, 1524?-1557

Although he was a musician rather than a man of letters, Parabosco wrote plays, novelle, a mythological work and a eulogy of Venetian ladies. Il Pellegrino is his only play in verse, and is based on the twelfth novel in the author's I disporti. Though not an original playwright, he was considered to be competent, and his plays enjoyed some success.

At the head of the first act is an illustration of the stage with the spectators below.

CINTIO, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, 1504-1573

Born in Ferrara, Giraldi studied and later became professor of natural history in his native city. His writings include nine plays including this one, Epitia. His later years were spent as professor of rhetoric at Pavia, a chair he occupied at the request of the Milan council.

This first edition of a verse tragedy based on one of the author's stories from his Hecatommithi, closely resembles that of Shakespeare's Measure for Measure, which may have been inspired by the same story.

MACHIAVELLI, NICCOLÒ, 1469-1527

Italian Renaissance theatre reached its intellectual high point with Machiavelli. La Mandragola is considered to be his best comedy and therefore the best "Commedia erudita" of the Renaissance. Written possibly between 1512 and 1520, it was first performed in 1520 and first published in 1524.

This printing is part of his L'Asino d'oro, con tutte l'altre sue operette (Roma, 1688). Actually the imprint is fictitious, and the work was really printed in London by John Wolfe who published unauthorized editions of works by various Italian writers.

GUARINI, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, 1538-1612

The epitome of all pastoral dramas and drawn upon by playwrights for as long as pastorals continued to be writen, Il Pastor fido is Guarini's attempt to outdo Tasso's Aminta, whose first performance he had witnessed in 1573. While not of Tasso's calibre poetically, Guarini was a craftsman, and his nine years' labour produced a play filled with every known stage trick, with characters whose speeches are more real and more vital than Tasso's, a play that produced countless imitations and volumes of literary criticism.

First performed in Turin in 1585 at the marriage festivities of D. Carlo Emanuele, Duca di Savoia and Catherine of Austria, Il Pastor fido went through forty editions in the seventeenth century and forty more in the eighteenth. The first English translation appeared in 1602; the second, by Sir Richard Fanshaw, in 1647. On display is the second edition (1648) of the latter translation, with a few of the editions Il Pastor fido in our collections.

Spain - The Golden Age

Case 3

The items in this section of the exhibition were selected by Arnold Reichenberger, Emeritus Professor, University of Pennsylvania, to illustrate his paper Editing Spanish Comedias of the XVIIth century: History and Present-Day Practice, given at the Eleventh Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, held at the University of Toronto, October 31st and November 1, 1975.

VEGA CARPIO, LOPE FÉLIX DE, 1562-1635

Recognized by Cervantes as the preeminent genius among Spanish dramatists and considered to be the founder of Spanish theatre, Vega Carpio won this acclaim simply by writing to please the audience. He was no follower of antique maxims; no unity of place and time for him, no decorous characters, no choruses narrating events unsuitable for the stage. The audience was his judge; whatever pleased them, whatever they accepted, he would continue to produce.

A prolific writer; the author of an estimated fifteen to eighteen hundred plays, of which over seven hundred are extant, he dramatised everything that to him seemed suitable. His only requirement was that the subject be stimulating and capable of being "hispanized". If the original was too long or too complicated, he broke it up into several plays. This brought him into direct conflict with many of his contemporaries, playwrights who were following the rules and not enjoying the same measure of success. Defending his work, Vega Carpio begged the indulgence of both audience and playwrights; spurred on by the demands of the former and by actors and producers, he was often forced to produce a play overnight. This play would then be performed the next night, leaving very little time for polish and revision. The audience accepted this, seeking only the entertainment to be found in Vega Carpio's topical comedies.

This does not mean he was a bad lyricist, When the subject of his play interested him poetically, he threw himself into it and was capable of creating great poetic dramas. His love was for the theatre, but he reserved the major part of his poetic ability for his epics and lyric compositions. Whatever one's opinion of him as a playwright, the stimulus he provided to Spanish Drama and the Spanish theatre, can not be denied, and in spite of their so-called superficiality, the dramas of Vega Carpio have survived to bring pleasure down to our age.

Our exhibition shows the 1611 edition of the second part of his collection Comedias.

SOLIS Y RIVADENEYRA, ANTONIO DE, 1610-1686

Statesman, historian and poet, Solis is perhaps best known for his authoratative work on the conquest of Mexico. He began writing at an early age and soon developed an elegant, precise style. His "comedias de capa y espada" became most famous when Spanish patriots, seeking to defend their native theatre against the attacks of the Gallicists, selected some of his plays as examples of those least opposed to the precepts of Boileau and maintaining the required unity of time. His plays have been called "neat miniatures drawn with freedom and integrity" but do not show great poetic ability. One must remember that playwriting was not his main occupation, but rather an escape from his duties as Secretary of State, and later secretary to Philip IV. and the Queen Dowager. With increasing age, he found his avocation sinful and found himself more drawn to a holy life. When he took holy orders at the age of fifty-seven, he gave up playwriting entirely, to the extent of leaving one of his best efforts incomplete.

On display are four editions of his work Amparar el enimigo.

VÉLEZ DE GUEVARA Y DUENAS, LUIS, 1579-1644

Vélez de Guevara, one of Spain's more important minor dramatists, wrote works that are not remarkable for their stagecraft or their didactic qualities, but are to be noted for their finely drawn images of life and the beauty of the speeches. Schack, the eminent nineteenth century critic and historian of Spanish dramatic literature, feels his plays satisfied the poetic sense of his audience and that is why they were able to overlook any other defects. His characters are not deeply defined, but one gets a sense of their individuality through their speeches, which can be witty and sharp. Indeed, the differences between the outwardly gentle nature of the characters and the pointed barbs of their speeches make his plays all the more interesting. Many of his epigrams became Spanish proverbs. His best plays deal with Spanish history; in his Si el cavallo vos han muerto the masterly portrayel of medieval Spanish knights and customs, together with the intensity of the action combine to make this one of his more successful plays.

The item on display is Professor Reichenberger's edition of Vélez de Guevara's El embuste acreditado y el disparate creido (Universidad de Granada, 1956).

PÉREZ DE MONTALVAN, JUAN, 1602-1638

Admirers of Montalvan's work consider him to be Vega Carpio's successor; an understandable conclusion, since Vega Carpio had so much influence on Montalvan's work. The son of Vega Carpio's bookseller, they met when Montalvan was very young, and as soon Montalvan began to show his poetic abilities, he was encouraged in his work by the "Phoenix of geniuses". Unfortunately

Montalvan became too dependant on Vega Carpio and tried to copy him. If he had developed his own gifts and followed his instincts, he would have been more successful, but he admired too highly Vega Carpio's financial success and attempted to match him in output. Since he did not have Vega Carpio's poetic ability and begrudged the time necessary for revision, his plays lack a sense of harmony and unity. Not to disparage him totally, he did have at least two particular gifts: the first being his portrayal of women. He seemed to have a knowledge of their characters "to be gained only by the closes observation and study [and] ... second only to ... Ovid" (2) His second gift was his ability to adapt plays. He appreciated the value of a good story and selected those dealing with historical subjects that would make good dramatic productions. Perhaps one should blame the time and his mentor more than the man himself. Vega Carpio's stature as a playwright and the climate he created in the history of Spanish theatre were overwhelming for someone lacking his dramatic and poetic talents.

We show a copy of Montalvan's Remedio, industria y valor. The date of publication of this item is uncertain, but it is bound in a collection compiled in the nineteenth century.

(2) G.W. Bacon, The life and dramatic works of Doctor Juan Pérez de Montalvan (New York: Hispanic Society of America, 1912), p. 56.

Editing English Renaissance Dramatic Texts

Most Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights were concerned solely with the performance of their plays in the theatre. Publication was an afterthought, and more often was initiated by the acting company, in order to establish exclusive property rights over the play, or by an enterprising publisher, than by the author. Authors merely submitted their final manuscript draft, commonly called their "foul papers", to the acting company for whom they were writing. This draft was then transcribed, with the necessary alterations, to create a clear and legible "prompt-book" on which the production could be based. Alterations usually involved the standardization of speech prefixes and the clarification or expansion of stage directions. When a play was published, the printer's copy could be the author's foul papers or transcripts of these, the prompt-bock itself, or a transcript of it, or other, more dubious texts which might rely on the memorial reconstruction of a play by the actors who had performed in previous productions, or on a shorthand version taken down during an actual performance. Frequently the contemporary published versions of plays were unauthorized piracies whose text had been greatly corrupted from what the author had originally written and intended. Many other plays remained unpublished during the author's lifetime. It was usually only after an author's death that an attempt was made to publish a collected edition of his works and that any care was taken to provide an authoritative text. While the individual plays which were published during the author's career were in a small quarto format, the collected works were published in handsome large folio volumes, prefaced by quantities of commendatory verses and tributes to the author's genius.

Early Quartos and Folios

Case 4

The quartos of plays by Massinger and Chapman, displayed in this case, and the facsimiles of the two Shakespearian quartos illustrate the varying reliability of plays published in this format. Chapman's Caesar and Pompey (1631) and Massinger's The Unnatural Combat (1639) are both exceptions to the general tendency of playwrights to be indifferent to the publication of their works. Both are relatively early efforts for which the authors themselves have arranged publication late in their careers. Chapman's dedicatory letter to the Earl of Middlesex reveals that, despite his play "being written so long since ... yet never toucht it at the Stage". Massinger, in his dedication, refers to "this old Tragedie" written before the current fashion for prologue and epilogue. Both authors appear to have been thinking of their posthumous reputation and to have taken the initiative for securing a good copy text for the printer, undoubtedly their own autograph manuscript.

With the Shakespearian quartos the circumstances are entirely different. The 1603 "bad" quarto of Hamlet, exhibited in facsimile, was obviously a piracy, unauthorized by either author or acting company. Less than two thirds of the length of the authoritative version, with speeches abridged and garbled, the text is probably based on a memorial reconstruction by a group of actors who had previously performed in the play. The eminent Shakespearian scholar, Sir Walter Greg, suggested that this version of Hamlet originally derived from an abridged and altered text made for a provincial tour. A comparison of the bad quarto's version of Hamlet's most famous soliloquy with the version in the "good" quarto, published in the following year and probably based on Shakespeare's foul papers, shows how corrupted the text could become in these pirated quartos. Eight of the nineteen plays which appeared in quarto editions in Shakespeare's lifetime are considered either "bad" or, in Greg's words, "doubtful". Of these only two were followed by corrected quartos. The others were not revised until the folio collection of 1623 which gives us the only authoritative text both for these corrupted plays and for the eighteen plays which had not been previously published in any form.

In 1620, four years after Shakespeare's death, two of his friends and fellow actors in the King's Men acting company, John Hemminge and Henry Condell, approached the printer William Jaggard with a proposal to issue a collected edition of the playwright's works. Hemminge and Condell carefully assembled and chose their texts for the printer, describing in the preface to the work their "care and paine" to replace the "diverse, stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious imposters" (by which they meant the bad quartos) with versions "cur'd and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them". Their words of praise for Shakespeare's celebrated "easiness" of invention mention that they have "scarse received from him a blot in his papers". This is only one of many pieces of evidence which show that, for some plays, Hemminge and Condell were working from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript papers. Modern textual scholars have identified the various types of underlying copy for the plays printed in the folio as foul papers and transcripts of these, prompt-books and transcripts of these and printed quarto texts, some of which were corrected after collation with manuscript versions. The preparation of texts for the printer, in fact, shows an unprecedented degree of care for establishing an accurate text.

Hemminge and Condell seem to have ceased their editorial labours, however, after providing the printer with good copy. They did not see the volume through the press, an operation which seems to have begun in April 1621, but was not finished until the end of 1623. Proofing was left, as usual, to the printers, and was probably carried out by William Jaggard's son, Isaac, who took over the printing house after the death of his father in 1623. The modern Shakespearian scholar, Charlton K. Hinman, who has made a number of revolutionary discoveries about the methods used to print and proof the first folio, has demonstrated that the folio's proof corrections were largely superficial, concerned chiefly with the elimination of typographical blemishes, and that, even where substantive readings were

involved, there was little, if any, consultation of the copy. Hinman also discovered that the folio had not been typeset by consecutive pages but by formes and that this method, involving inevitable miscalculations in the casting-off of copy, led to mis-lining of verse and the omission of stage directions or short lines at the bottom of pages. Thus the text of the first folio, while the sole authority for those plays which had previously been unpublished, or published only in bad quarto editions, is not always preferable to the earlier good quarto texts. It was, however, more than three centuries before subsequent editors of Shakespeare could make an objective estimate of the strengths and the weaknesses of what will always remain one of the most important books of the world.

In complete contrast to Shakespeare, who seems never to have taken any interest in the publication of his plays, Ben Jonson took meticulous care over the publication of a collection of his plays in 1616. Jonson is presumed to have prepared the manuscript copy for the printer himself, adding details of the first performance of each play and listing the original cast members, among whom was, on occasion, one Will. Shakespeare. Jonson is also known to have corrected proofs himself. His 1616 collection, however, contained only nine of his plays and the remainder were not collected until after his death when in 1640 Richard Meighen published a two volume folio edition of his works.

The 1647 folio edition of the collected works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher was also a posthumous publication, initiated and overseen by the publisher Humphrey Mosley, who perhaps had been inspired to begin this most ambitious undertaking of his whole publishing career by the success of the Shakespeare folio which had reached a second edition after only nine years. None of the thirty-four plays included in this collection, however, had been previously printed in any form. Mosley states in his preface that he "had the Originals from such as received them from the Authours themselves; by Those, and none other, I publish this Edition". The manuscripts used were thus, for the most part, the licensed prompt-books from the King's Men. Two were based on prompt-books from another company of actors and ten appear to be from other sources. Mosley seems to have taken great trouble to secure authoritative texts for each play, asserting that "the care & Pains was wholly mine, which I found to be more than you'l easily imagine, unlesse you knew into how many hands the Originalls were dispersed".

Later Shakespeare Folios and the First Eighteenth Century Edition

Case 5

Textual corruption is already apparent in the second Shakespeare folio, published in 1632. Although this edition was merely a reprinting, column by column, of the first folio, the printer or proofreader did

modernize some of the spellings, and alter punctuation. He also corrected some of the typographical errors from the first folio, but created a large number of new ones. In addition there was an attempt to clarify a number of textual obscurities made by an "editor" who used no authority except his own opinion. It was this "editor" whom the great Shakespearian scholar, Edmond Malone, called one of the "two great corrupters of our poet's text" (the other being Pope) because "he always cuts a knot, instead of untying it".

The third folio, published in 1663, was based on the second, with further modernization and corruption of the text. This edition was the first to include Pericles, which had previously appeared only in quarto editions. The other six newly included plays in this edition were falsely attributed to Shakespeare.

The fourth folio, published in 1685, was based on the preceding third, again with increasing textual corruption. The copy displayed is open at Hamlet's soliloquy to show the modernization of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization which has taken place since the quarto version and an example of the typographical errors that abounded by the fourth folio. While changes of "Hart-ake" to "Heart-ache", "hew" to "hue", or "sinnes" to "sins" seem unexceptionable, the lines "Nymph, in thy Horizons / Be all my sins remembred" are more disturbing. "Orizons" of the quarto and first two folios, has been corrupted to "Horizons" in both third and fourth folios.

In 1709 Nicholas Rowe issued his edition of Shakespeare in six octavo volumes. Himself a poet and dramatist, Rowe edited Shakespeare's texts as he would his own. He completed the division into acts and scenes and appended lists of dramatis personae to plays lacking these in the folios. He wrote stage directions, clarified entrances and exits, and gave a specific location for most scenes. He prefaced the plays with the first formal biography of Shakespeare, a brief sketch of forty pages which relied chiefly on local legends and theatrical traditions given to him by the seventeenth century actor Thomas Betterton. Although he based his edition of the text of the fourth folio, and continued the policy of modernization of spelling and punctuation, Rowe saw the need to return to the earlier texts in order to elucidate obscure passages. His preface states that he has "taken some Care to redeem him [Shakespeare] from the Injuries of former Impressions", and claims that he has compared the surviving editions, folio and quarto, in order to give "the true Reading as well as I could from thence. This I have endeavour'd to do pretty carefully, and render'd very many Places Intelligible, that were not so before".

Taste versus Scholarship: The Quarrel Begun

Case 6

In 1725 Alexander Pope brought out the first volume of his six volume edition of Shakespeare, based on the second edition of Rowe's work. Far more fully than Rowe, however, Pope recognized the value of the quartos and made regular use of them to correct Rowe's text, restoring whole passages which had appeared in the quartos but had been dropped from the folios, and correcting many corrupted readings. A table at the end of Pope's final volume lists twenty-nine quartos which he claims to have examined. In his preface he maintains:

> I have discharg'd the dull duty of an Editor, to my best judgment, with more labour than I expect thanks, with a religious abhorrence of all Innovation, and without any indulgence to my private sense or conjecture.

In practise, Pope was guided more by taste than by scholarship in his choice of readings and approached his text in the spirit of literary excutor, anxious to present his author in the best light possible. He made "silent" changes which he felt improved the versification and metre and, lacking an understanding of Elizabethan English, he emended the double comparatives and superlatives, perfectly correct in Shakespeare's time, to conform to eighteenth century grammatical standards. Pope's reliance on his very eighteenth century taste led him completely astray in his judgments on the authenticity of several passages. His preface explains that when certain passages seemed to be "excessively bad" these are "degraded to the bottom of the page, with an Asterisk referring to the places of their insertion". One of the volumes on display shows two of the more famous images from Macbeth thus "degraded": one, "Sleep that knits up the ravell'd sleeve of care", the other, "Thy multitudinous sea incarnadine / Making the green one red". Mere actor's rant in Pope's opinion.

In 1726 Lewis Theobald published an attack on Pope's edition of Shakespeare which he entitled Shakespeare Restored: or, A Specimen of the Many Errors, as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet. In this work, which he described as "designed not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the Editions ever yet Publish'd", Theobald was the first to attempt to apply the principles of textual criticism, which had governed the editing of classical texts, to an English author. Theobald was also the first editor with enough scholarship to study Shakespeare in his historical and literary context, illuminating some of the difficult passages through references to and comparisons with the writings of his contemporaries and some of his source materials. Realizing the changes in language which had occurred since Shakespeare's characters first spoke, Theobald did not, like Pope, see Shakespeare's grammar and syntax in need of correction. Although the play which Theobald selected for lengthy consideration in his attack was Hamlet, his appendix includes arguments against Pope's emenda-

tion, changing Mistress Quickley's description of the dying Falstaff (Henry V. II.iii.16-17) from "For his Nose was as sharp as a Pen, and a Table of greene fields" (which Pope had explained as the incorporation of a garbled stage direction to the property manager, Mr. Greenfield, to bring on a table) to "For his Nose was as sharp as a Pen, and a' babled of green Fields". Although this emendation has the inspired poetic "rightness" which earlier editors, following intuition and their own poetic insight, were seeking, Theobald based his reading partly on his knowledge of Elizabethan handwriting, defending it on the grounds that here "we may still come nearer to the Traces of the Letters".

Theobald's complete edition of Shakespeare appeared in 1733. In his table of editions consulted he lists forty-one quartos, of which twenty-eight are earlier than the first folio. Although the editions of both Pope and Rowe are listed under the heading "Editions of no Authority", and although many notes contain long diatribes against Pope, Theobald used as a basis for his text a corrected copy of Pope's latest edition and preserved many readings which Pope had emended on little or no authority. Nevertheless, more than three hundred of Theobald's emendations are still generally accepted and he retains his place as the first scholarly editor of Shakespeare.

Enraged by Theobald's attack on his edition, Pope revenged himself by making Theobald the hero of his first version of the Dunciad, and has his King of Dunces boast

> Here studious I unlucky moderns save,
> Nor sleeps one error in its father's grave,
> Old puns restore, lost blunders nicely seek,
> And crucify poor Shakespear once a week.
>
> (Dunciad, 1728. I.161-4)

The Quarrel Continued

Case 7

In 1744 Sir Thomas Hanmer, Speaker of the House of Commons and a gentleman of great culture and taste, published a sumptuous edition of Shakespeare, beautifully printed by the Oxford Press, with full page engravings illustrating each play. The very elegance of this edition perhaps betrays its editor's concern with good taste and propriety rather than with scholarship. Hanmer consulted no text earlier than Pope's and, like Pope, he reduced to the bottom of the page those passages which seemed unworthy of the genius of his author. Among the pieces offensive to Hanmer's cultivated eighteenth century mind was a "wretched piece of ribaldry" in

Henry V and what he summarized as "a great deal more of that low stuff which disgraces the works of this great Author ... foisted in by the Players after his death".

William Warburton issued in 1747 what was supposedly a new edition of Pope's Shakespeare in which he defended Pope against Theobald's strictures and ridiculed the editions of both Theobald and Hanmer. Warburton had based his edition, however, on Theobald's text and had incorporated, without acknowledgement, many of his emendations. In other places Warburton had followed his own fancy and taste and rejected well authenticated readings for his own conjectural ones. His notes are sometimes useful but more often idiosyncratic and filled with conceit and invective against other editors.

Warburton's edition was immediately attacked and his methods satirized by Thomas Edwards in a work entitled The Canons of Criticism, first published in 1748. Edwards' satirical list of critical canons purports to be an objective statement of the editorial principles which Warburton must have followed in preparing his "most perfect edition of Shakespear". The list is then amplified by examples showing the application of these principles in the texts of various plays. The canons begin:

> A Professed Critic has a right to declare that his Author wrote whatever He thinks he ought to have written, with as much positiveness as if He had been as his Elbow.

and continue with such principles as:

> He has the right to alter any passage, which He does not understand.
> He need not attend to the low accuracy of orthography or pointing; but may ridicule such trivial criticisms in others.
> He may explane a difficult passage by words absolutely unintelligible.

to culminate in the final canon:

> He may dispense with truth in order to give the word a higher idea of his parts, or of the value of his work.

In 1745 Samuel Johnson had published a review and criticism of Hanmer's edition in which he had outlined his own views on the editing of Shakespeare under the title "Miscellaneous Observations on the Tragedy of Macbeth". In 1756 he issued his Proposals for Printing the Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare. In these he stressed the importance of collating the oldest surviving texts and the necessity of including in the notes all variant readings. He also emphasized the editor's need to have a detailed knowledge of Elizabethan literature and language before making any attempt at textual emendation. Johnson's modest and inclusive statement of an editor's aim could surely stand as epigraph and inspiration for every editor in every age.

> The business of him that republishes an ancient book is, to correct what is corrupt, and to explain what is obscure.

Nine years later, in 1765, Johnson's edition appeared. It was the best text which had yet been published, although based initially on a corrected copy of Warburton's edition of 1747 and subsequently on a newly published edition of Theobald's. Johnson was not as systematic in his textual study or in the application of his editorial principles as were his successors, but he was the first to assert that the old texts were the right texts, that only the early quartos and the first folio could provide authoritative readings, and that emendations must be based on textual authority and not on literary merit. His editorial principles are clearly evident in his note on the phrase "In hugger mugger to inter him" (Hamlet. IV.v.80) which had been emended by previous editors to read "In private to inter him". Johnson writes:

> That the words now replaced are better, I do not undertake to prove; it is sufficient that they are Shakespeare's ...

Instead of indulging in conjectural emendation, he sometimes frankly concedes defeat. "What this means I do not know" he writes in one note, and he admits that "as I practised conjecture more, I learned to trust it less".

Edward Capell never practised conjecture at all. He had been so distressed by the lack of editing evinced in Hanmer's tasteful edition of 1744 and the increased corruption of Shakespeare's text that he resolved to prepare an edition himself, first making a collection of all the folios and as many quartos as he could locate, and then spending the next twenty years in careful collation and minute study. Describing his procedure in his preface he writes that the editor "had not proceeded far in his collation, before he saw cause to come to this resolution; - to stick invariably to the old editions (that is, the best of them), which hold now the place of manuscripts". His ten volume edition appeared in 1768 but the Notes and Various Readings which should have accompanied it were not published until 1783, two years after his death, by which time the reputation of his edition had been eclipsed by that of Steevens. Capell's throughness in collation marked a major advance in editing practise and his importance and scholarship has in the past been underestimated.

In 1766 George Steevens produced the first reprint of the quartos, under the title Twenty Plays of Shakespeare being the Whole Number Printed in Quarto, and for the first time the quarto texts were made available to any interested reader who might otherwise have been unable to find the excessively rare originals. It was to Steevens that Dr. Johnson entrusted the preparation of a new edition of his Shakespeare. The resulting work first appeared in 1773 and was revised in 1778, 1785, and in 1793. Steevens' unrivalled knowledge of Elizabethan literature and his intensive study of the quartos made his edition, although based directly on Dr. Johnson's text, a more comprehensive and authoritative work. Steevens is more often remembered, however, as "the Puck of Commentators" who indulged himself in writing eccentric notes on some of the more salacious passages in the plays and maliciously attributing them to clergymen with whom he had quarrelled.

Scholarship Triumphant

Case 8

Edmond Malone was the last and possibly the greatest of the eighteenth century Shakespearian editors and scholars. Initially a friend of George Steevens, although later a rival, Malone contributed to Steevens' 1778 edition of Shakespeare an important essay entitled "An attempt to Ascertain the Order in which the Plays of Shakespeare were written", which was the first study of its kind. Malone's own ten volume edition of Shakespeare appeared in 1790 and contained the first authoritative treatise on early English drama, entitled "An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage", and based on a consultation of all the contemporary records which Malone could uncover. Malone was also the first to discover a source for Shakespeare's Tempest in William Strachey's manuscript narrative of his shipwreck with Sir George Somers on the islands of the Bermudas in 1609. Edmond Malone's contribution to Shakespearian scholarship was enormous, and his familiarity with Elizabethan documents made him immediately suspicious when news of an exciting new discovery of Shakespearian manuscripts was announced in 1795.

In 1796 Samuel Ireland, engraver, antiquary, and author, published a work entitled Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments under the Hand and Seal of William Shakespeare which described and reproduced a number of supposedly authentic Shakespearian manuscripts, newly discovered by Samuel's son, William, during a visit to Stratford. William Henry Ireland, just nineteen at the time when his "finds" were published, was a lawyer's clerk and, through his work, well acquainted with Elizabethan documents and handwriting. In 1795 he had convinced his father of the authenticity of several leases, contracts, letters, and even a confession of faith, all supposedly in Shakespeare's hand or bearing his signature. The manuscripts were displayed at the Ireland home where several eminent men of letters, among them James Boswell, came to pay homage to them. Edmond Malone, however, too meticulous a scholar to be deceived, declared the manuscripts forgeries in his Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Miscellaneous Papers and Legal Instruments, published the same year as Ireland's work. W.H. Ireland, who had meanwhile "discovered" two new plays by Shakespeare, then confessed his fraud, and wrote An Authentic Account of the Shakespearian Manuscripts while his father composed A Vindication of his Conduct. In 1797 George Chalmers, a Scottish antiquarian who had been taken in by the forgeries, published An Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers, in which he outlined his reasons for believing in the papers, displaying an impressive knowledge of the English stage and of Elizabethan punctuation as well as much perversity of argument. W.H. Ireland published his more lengthy Confessions in 1805, and thereafter turned to a rather unsuccesful literary career as a novelist.

Malone continued his editorial work on Shakespeare and was engaged in preparing a new edition at the time of his death in 1812. His papers were

bequeathed to his friend and assistant, James Boswell, son of Johnson's biographer, and in 1821 Boswell brought out a twenty-one volume "variorum" edition. A major landmark in Shakespearian criticism, the work presents a summary of all the editorial advances made throughout the eighteenth century and it was to remain an essential edition for the scholars of nineteenth century. Capell, Steevens, and Malone were the pioneering textual critics of their century, moving the study of Shakespeare out of the realm of taste and into the arena of scholarship.